

REMARKS

Responsive to the Official Action mailed March 28, 2008, applicant has amended the claims of his application in an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance. Specifically, independent claims 1, 22 and 23 have been amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In accordance with the Examiner's responses requirements, applicant has submitted herewith revised application drawings. Additionally, the application specification has been revised so that it is consistent with the revised drawings. Entry is respectfully requested.

In the Action, the Examiner rejected the pending claims under 35 USC § 112, referring to language in claims 1, 22, and 23. These claims have been revised in a manner which is believed to clarify the claimed subject matter, and accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection can be withdrawn.

In rejecting the pending claims under 35 USC §§ 102 and 103, the Examiner has relied upon U.S. Patent No. 4,865,360 to Adams, and U.S. Patent No. 6,622,573, to Kleven. As set forth in the amended claims, it is believed that applicant's pipe coupling construction clearly patentably distinct from these references, and accordingly, the Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

In connection with the rejections based upon the Adams reference, it is respectfully submitted that this patent does not teach or suggest a pipe coupling construction such as set forth in amended claim 22, wherein the pipe flanges of the construction each comprise a central bore, first and second ports for receiving valves, a take-off channel for linking the first port with the central bore, and a feed channel for linking the first port with the second port, wherein the second port links with the

exterior of the flange. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection based upon the Adams reference can be withdrawn.

With respect to the Kleven patent, it is respectfully noted that the present invention would not be obvious to a person skilled in the art in light of the teachings of this reference. The solution to the problem of pressure take off from process pipes proposed by the present invention involves the provision of ports and channels, wherein the pipe flanges are unique to the present inventor. It is respectfully noted that in spite of the teachings of the Kleven reference, the construction is still much more complicated than required by the present invention.

The problems with prior art systems are clearly set forth on pages 1 through 4 of the present specification, as filed. Kleven does not solve any of these problems in the manner claimed in the instant invention. In particular, Kleven does not teach the provision of channels within the pipe flanges in order to link various valves. Kleven actually makes use of an orifice plate rather than pipe flanges. Additionally, Kleven does not use a bridge element spanning the pipe flanges. Furthermore, Kleven is concerned with an instrument valve, rather than a piping class valve.

If the solution to the problems, with which the present invention is concerned, were obvious to a person skilled in the art, it would have been expected that major members of the industry would have developed solutions along the same lines as the present invention. It is respectfully noted that this is clearly not the case, as evidenced by examples of current systems offered by PGI International and Parker Instruments. The industry continues to seek to solve the problems by making their equipment more robust to stand vibration and knocks. Nevertheless, attachment of

measuring instruments to process pipe is still relatively remote, requiring more complicated bridge structures and is necessary with the present invention, which takes connections usually made in the bridge into the pipe flanges themselves. The present invention reduces the need for fittings that are an inherent weakness of prior art designs. The more fittings that are required, the more likelihood of leakage, which with some materials flowing through the pipelines can be hazardous.

In view of the foregoing, formal allowance of claims 1 through 26 is believed to be in order and is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below. If the Examiner notes any matters which the Examiner believes may be expedited by a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Stephen D. Geimer, Reg. No. 28,846

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,
CLARK & MORTIMER
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800
Chicago, IL 60661
(312) 876-1800